

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 12, 2003. Claims 1-8, 11-18, 20-29 and 31-53 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 22, 23, 31, 36, 41 and 51-53 are in independent form. Claims 9, 10, 19 and 30 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and Claims 51-53 have been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1-4, 7, 11-18, 20-25, 27-29, 31-34, 36-39, 41-44 and 49 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication that Claims 3, 13, 24, 32, 35, 37, 40, 42, and 45 include allowable subject matter would be allowable if rewritten in proper independent form. Those claims have not been so amended at this time, however, because for the reasons set out below, their base claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1 and 3-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, and a formal objection was entered against Claim 2. Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended the claims as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21-23, 26, 27, 31, 36, 41 and 46-49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,228,18 (Sasaki). In addition, Claims 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 17, 18, 20, 25, 28-30, 33, 34, 38, 39, 43, 44 and 50 were rejected

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sasaki* in view of U.S. Patent 5,907,666 (Yano et al.)

Independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus that includes a common printer driver module for commonly processing a connected printer irrespective of the type of the connected printer, and a plurality of individual printer driver modules that are each for differently processing the connected printer depending on the printer type. The information processing apparatus performs switching among the plurality of individual printer driver modules in accordance with the printer type, and outputs information processed by the switching module to the connected printer.

Independent Claim 2 is directed to an information processing apparatus identical to that of Claim 1 except that the module switching is performed in accordance with information indicating the printer type obtained from the printer.

Sasaki relates to a printing system in which a printer driver is selected from among a plurality of drivers, based on what interpreters are available on the printer. The details of this selection are illustrated in the flow chart of Fig. 7, which shows that a search for compatible drivers is performed based on information provided by the printer to an inquiry about available interpreters. Applicant strongly asserts, however, that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in *Sasaki* that would teach or suggest dividing a printer driver into a common printer driver module for commonly processing a connected printer irrespective of the type of the connected printer, and a plurality of individual printer driver modules each for differently processing the connected printer depending on the printer type, as recited in both Claims 1 and 2.

Those claims, therefore, are believed to be clearly allowable over *Sasaki*.

Each of the other independent claims recites features like that on which the allowability of Claims 1 and 2 is based, and each is deemed also to be allowable over *Sasaki*, for the same reasons as are Claims 1 and 2.


A review of the other art of record, including *Yano*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicant
Lock See Yeh-JATTNES
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 362759v1